

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-16 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-4 and 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Figure 9C was originally a figure that showed locking lever 72 in its locked position and detent override lever 94 in its released position. The Examiner is correct that as shown in Figure 9C the table is locked to the base. That is why in the original specification on page 11 beginning at line 7, it describes movement as taking place when locking lever 72 is at the position shown in Figures 9A or 9B (its unlocked position) and lever 94 is in the position shown in Figure 9C. When this lever configuration is set, the table can be moved. This same description appears beginning on page 11, line 23 (the last line). Applicant understands the confusion that has occurred due to the referencing of levers 72 and 94 from different figures. Figure 9C has been revised to show both levers 72 and 94 in their locked position. New Figure 9D has been added to show both levers 72 and 94 in their released position. The specification has been amended to refer to the new Figure 9D. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection by the Examiner. Applicant did not define the entire detent system as being disposed between the table and the base. Thus, Applicant believes that if any part of the detent system is disposed between the table and the base, it is proper to define the detent system as being disposed between the table and the base. Regardless, Applicant has deleted the reference regarding the disposition of the detent system in Claims 1 and 11. Also, the reference as to the disposition of the locking mechanism has also been deleted. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding the pivotal attachment of the detent lever or the locking lever to the table, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The two levers are pivotally attached to the housing which is attached to the table. Applicant did not define the levers as being pivotally attached directly to the table. Applicant has amended the claim language to clarify this issue. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 11, 2004

By:


Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg